UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,530	02/12/2004	Yu-Ru Lin	4444-0136P	4145

2292 7590 11/05/2007

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER	
FLEURANTIN, JEAN B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/05/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/776,530	LIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JEAN B. FLEURANTIN	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 August 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This is in response to Applicant(s) arguments filed on 08/22/2007.

The following is the current status of claims:

Claims 1-22 remain pending for examination.

Applicant's arguments filed on 08/22/2007, with respect to the pending claims have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons, see sections I (response to arguments) and II (repeated rejections).

I.) The abstract submitted on 08/22/2007 complies with the MPEP § 608.01(b)).

Therefore, the abstract has been entered considered.

In response to applicant's arguments, page 14, paragraph 2 (*Objection to the Abstract*), amendment to the abstract has overcome the objection. Therefore, the objection has been withdrawn.

In response to applicant's arguments, page 14, paragraph 3 (*Double Patenting Rejection*), amendment to the claims does not overcome the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Therefore, the rejection(s) maintain(s).

In response to applicant's arguments, page 14, paragraph 2 (*Rejection under 35 USC 103*), amendments to claims 1-19, overcome the 35 USC 101 rejections. Therefore, the rejections have been withdrawn. However, the 35 USC 101 rejections of claims 20-22 maintain, and set forth.

In response to applicant's arguments, page 15, last paragraph to page 17, paragraph 3 (*Rejection under 35 USC 103*), amendment to claims does not place the application in condition for allowance. Because the prior art of record discloses the claimed limitations.

In response to applicant's argument, page 17 paragraphs 2 and 3 "neither the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art nor Heo, either alone or in combination, anticipate the method of independent claims 1, 9 and 15, and their dependent claims." the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, *the present invention* relates to a system and method for computer generating media production. Further, in page 2, para 0003, the invention details an input signal includes one or more pieces of media, which is presented as an input to the system, in which supported media types include video, image, slideshow, music, speech, sound effects, animation and graphics.

Correspondingly, Heo discloses method and apparatus for mixing a multiplicity of audio data obtained from respective multiple channels; see para 0003.

Gang discloses a method for the prediction of musical preferences, which is able to every song, an estimate of the degree of interest by the specific user for the specific song; para 0001 and 0012. Thus, the combination discloses the claimed limitations.

Furthermore, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

MPEP 2111: During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification" Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecussion and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969). The court found that applicant was advocating ... the impermissible importation of subject matter from the specification into the claim. See also In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d

1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The court held that the PTO is not required, in the course of prosecution, to interpret claims in applications in the same manner as a court would interpret claims in an infringement suit. Rather, the "PTO applies to verbiage of the proposed claims the broadest reasonable meaning of the words in their ordinary usage as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, taking into account whatever enlightenment by way of definition or otherwise that may be afforded by the written description contained in application's specification.").

Moreover, with regard to the independent claims, APA discloses "a method for ~~of media~~ editing media in an electronic apparatus with digital audio/video processing capability" (see Fig. 1 and items 102, 103, 104 and 106), comprising receiving audio data and a plurality of associated audio descriptors, which describe characteristic of said audio data from an audio source connecting to said electronic apparatus; receiving visual data and a plurality of associated visual descriptors, which describe characteristic of said visual data" (i.e., input signals and including one or more pieces of media, and supported media types include: video, music, sounds, etc.,; see page 2, lines 5-8 and Fig. 1 and item 101), "from an video source connecting to said electronic apparatus" (i.e., input signals and includes one or more pieces of media, supported media types include: video, music, sounds, etc.,; see page 2, lines 5-8 and Fig. 1 and item 101); "determining a plurality of corresponding weights for said visual data; correlating said audio data and said visual data based on said corresponding weights, said associated audio descriptors, and said associated visual descriptors" (i.e., analyzer includes video analyzer, soundtrack analyzer, and image analyzer. The analyzer measures of the rate of change and statistical properties of other descriptors, descriptors derived by combining two or more other descriptors; the video analyzer measures the probability that the segment of an input video contains a human face, probability that it is a natural scene, etc. The soundtrack analyzer measures audio intensity or loudness, frequency content, categorical, rate of change and statistical properties, in short, the analyzer receives input signal and outputs descriptors which describe features of input signal; see page 10-16 and Fig. 1).

APA fail to explicitly disclose adjusting said audio data and said visual data to construct a media output. However, Heo discloses adjusting said audio data and said visual data to construct a media

output (see Heo pp [0050]). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of APA by adjusting said audio data and said visual data to construct a media output as disclosed by Heo (see Heo pp [0049]). Such a modification would allow the method of APA to provide an audio mixed method and apparatus capable of mixing and reproducing different types of channel components without changing the channel formats of audio streams (see Heo pp [0010]), therefore, improving the accuracy of the system and method for the automatic and semi-automatic media editing. While the combination of APA/Heo substantially discloses the claimed invention, the combination fails to disclose in detail "said weights *indicating qualities*, importance, or preference of said visual data" However, Gang discloses said weights *indicating qualities*, importance, or preference of said visual data (see Gang para [0064]). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of APA/Heo by said weights *indicating qualities*, importance, or preference of said visual data as disclosed by Gang (see Gang para 0064, particularly lines 3-6). Such a modification would allow the method of APA/Heo to provide an expected rating for every song in the catalog, this expected rating provides, for every song, an estimate of the degree of interest by the specific user for the specific song (see para [0012]).

The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. In re Cortright, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

For the above reasons, it is believed that the last Office Action dated 22 May 2007 was proper. Therefore, the rejection is repeated.

Claim / Specification Objections

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The claimed "medium" as recite in claim 20, line 1.

Claim 21, line 1; and claim 22, line 1.

Further, see MPEP 608.01 and 2173.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2, 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2, 10 and 16 are rejected because of "**and/or**" which renders the claim indefinite.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending U.S Patent Application No. 10/845,218. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to the Patent Application No. 10/845,218 claim 1 to interchangeably "media" to "video production" in order to provide summarizing videos in the most efficient manner; see patent Application No. 10/845,218.

Claim 1 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/845,218 contain(s) every element of claim 1 of instant application serial No. 10/776,530 and thus anticipate the claim 1 of the instant application. Claim 1 of the instant application therefore are not patently distinct from the earlier patent application claim 1 and as such as are unpatentable over obvious-type double patenting. A later patent/application claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier claim if the later claim is anticipated by the earlier claim.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Instant application 10/776,530	10/845,218
A method for ~~of media~~ editing media in an electronic apparatus with digital audio/video processing capability, comprising:	A method of video production editing, comprising:
receiving audio data and a plurality of associated audio descriptors, which describe characteristic of said audio data, from an audio source connecting to said electronic apparatus;	
receiving visual data and a plurality of associated visual descriptors, which describe characteristic of said visual data, from an video source connecting to said electronic apparatus;	receiving video data and a plurality of associated video descriptors, which describe characteristic of said video data;
determining a plurality of corresponding weights for said visual data, said weights indicating qualities, importance, or preference of said visual data; correlating said audio data and said visual data based on said corresponding weights, said associated audio descriptors, and said associated visual descriptors; and	determining a plurality of descriptive scores for said associated video descriptors, wherein at least one of said descriptive scores is corresponding to one of said associated video descriptors; and
adjusting said audio data and said visual data to construct a media output.	adjusting said video data based on at least one of said descriptive scores to construct a video production.

"A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or anticipated by, the earlier claim. In re Longi, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651

(affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus)." ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court of Appeals for the federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

"Claims 1, 9, 15 & 20-22 and Claims 1, 13 & 17-20 are generic to the species of invention covered by claims 1-2 of the patent. Thus, the generic invention is "anticipated" by the species of the patented invention. Cf., Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (holding that earlier species disclosure in the prior art defeats any generic claim). This court's predecessor has held that, without a terminal disclaimer, the species claims preclude issuance of the generic application. In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 944, 214 USPQ 761, 767 (CCPA 1982); Schneller, 397 F.2d at 354. Accordingly, absent a terminal disclaimer, claims 1 and were properly rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting." (In re Goodman (CAFC) 29 USPQ2d 2010 (12/3/1993).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As set forth in MPEP 2106:

As per independent claims 20-22

The independent claims 20-22 are directed to computer-readable *medium*, in which receiving audio/video data. The claimed steps are not being performed by any form of computer hardware component. Therefore, the mechanism for correlating the audio/video data and visual data as the purpose of the invention. The claimed, "medium" fails to fall with one of four statutory categories of invention, process, machine, manufacture and composition, and is software per se.

And, all pending claims are rejected under the same rational.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7 & 9-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art, Figure 1, specification pages 1-2, up to line 30 ("APA") in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0138873 issued to Heo et al., ("Heo"), and further in view of USPubNo. 2003/0089218 issued to Gang et al., ("Gang").

As per claim 1, APA discloses "a method for ~~of media~~ editing media in an electronic apparatus with digital audio/video processing capability" (see Fig. 1 and items 102, 103, 104 and 106), comprising receiving audio data and a plurality of associated audio descriptors, which describe characteristic of said audio data from an audio source connecting to said electronic apparatus; receiving visual data and a plurality of associated visual descriptors, which describe characteristic of said visual data" (i.e., input signals and including one or more pieces of media, and supported media types include: video, music, sounds, etc.,; see page 2, lines 5-8 and Fig. 1 and item 101), "from an video source connecting to said electronic apparatus" (i.e., input signals and includes one or more pieces of media, supported media types include: video, music, sounds, etc.,; see page 2, lines 5-8 and Fig. 1 and item 101);

"determining a plurality of corresponding weights for said visual data; correlating said audio data and said visual data based on said corresponding weights, said associated audio descriptors, and said associated visual descriptors" (i.e., analyzer includes video analyzer, soundtrack analyzer, and image analyzer. The analyzer measures of the rate of change and statistical properties of other descriptors, descriptors derived by combining two or more other descriptors; the video analyzer measures the probability that the segment of an input video contains a human face, probability that it is a natural scene,

etc. The soundtrack analyzer measures audio intensity or loudness, frequency content, categorical, rate of change and statistical properties, in short, the analyzer receives input signal and outputs descriptors which describe features of input signal; see page 10-16 and Fig. 1).

APA fail to explicitly disclose adjusting said audio data and said visual data to construct a media output. However, Heo discloses adjusting said audio data and said visual data to construct a media output (see Heo pp [0050]). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of APA by adjusting said audio data and said visual data to construct a media output as disclosed by Heo (see Heo pp [0049]). Such a modification would allow the method of APA to provide an audio mixed method and apparatus capable of mixing and reproducing different types of channel components without changing the channel formats of audio streams (see Heo pp [0010]), therefore, improving the accuracy of the system and method for the automatic and semi-automatic media editing.

While the combination of APA/Heo substantially discloses the claimed invention, the combination fails to disclose in detail "said weights *indicating qualities*, importance, or preference of said visual data" However, Gang discloses said weights *indicating qualities*, importance, or preference of said visual data (see Gang para [0064]). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of APA/Heo by said weights *indicating qualities*, importance, or preference of said visual data as disclosed by Gang (see Gang para 0064, particularly lines 3-6). Such a modification would allow the method of APA/Heo to provide an expected rating for every song in the catalog, this expected rating provides, for every song, an estimate of the degree of interest by the specific user for the specific song (see para [0012]).

As per claim 2, in addition to claim 1, APA further discloses "rendering said media output with style information to an audio and/or video output devices built in or connecting to said electronic apparatus" (i.e., outputting an edit decisions signal; see page 2, lines 20-21).

As per claim 3, in addition to claim 1, APA further discloses "receiving an audio signal from said audio source and analyzing and segmenting said audio signal for generating said audio data and said associated audio descriptors, wherein said audio data consists of a plurality of audio segments" (i.e., measuring segment, input video and audio intensity; see page 2, lines 10-18).

As per claim 4, in addition to claim 1, APA further discloses "receiving visual data and said associated visual descriptors comprises receiving a plurality of visual segments and said associated visual descriptors from said video source" (i.e., measuring the probability that the segment of an input video contains a human face; see page 2, lines 12-14 and Fig. 1).

As per claim 5, in addition to claim 1, APA further discloses "determining a plurality of corresponding weights comprises calculating any said corresponding weight for respective said visual segment" (i.e., measuring the probability that the segment of an input video contains a human face, and probability; see page 2, lines 12-14).

As per claim 7, in addition to claim 1, APA further discloses "receiving an audio signal from said video source; and generating a plurality of audio indices by choosing said audio signal with audio change therein" (i.e., measuring the probability and statistical properties; see page 2, lines 12-16 and Fig. 1).

As per claim 9, in addition to claim 1, APA further discloses "extracting a visual duration, from said associated visual descriptors, for each said visual segment; extracting an audio duration, from said associated audio descriptors, for each said audio segment; finding a sequence of visual segments with a correlating score that is the maximal within said plurality of correlating scores"

As per claims 10-20, the limitations of claims 10-20 are similar to claims 1-5, 7, 9 and 21-22, therefore, the limitations of 10-20 are rejected in the analysis of claims 1-5, 7, 9 and 21-22, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As per claim 21, the limitations of claim 21 are similar to claim 9, therefore, the limitations of 21 are rejected in the analysis of claim 9, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

As per claim 22, the limitations of claim 22 are similar to claim 1, therefore, the limitations of 22 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

Claim Objections / Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6 & 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

CONTACT INFORMATION

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEAN B. FLEURANTIN whose telephone number is 571 – 272-4035. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:05 to 4:35.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN E BREENE can be reached on 571 – 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jean Bolte Fleurantin

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2100

C. Rones

CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER